

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

Claims 1-5, 18, 49-53, 55-56, 64, and 66 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Hence, Claims 1-23, 47, and 49-72 are pending in the present application.

The issues raised in the Office Action mailed October 8, 2009 are addressed hereinafter.

### **I. ISSUES RELATED TO THE CITED ART**

#### **A. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1**

Claim 1 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Abrams et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,675,350 (“ABRAMS”) in view of Polizzi et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0052954 (“POLIZZI”), and further in view of Holzner, *Sams Teach Yourself JavaServer Pages in 21 Days*, two pages printed from SAFARI Books Online on September 25, 2009 (“HOLZNER”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

##### **1. The HOLZNER Reference.**

The Office Action relies on the HOLZNER reference in combination with other references to reject the claims in the present application. However, there appear to be two problems with the HOLZNER reference.

First, a publication date does not appear anywhere on the two pages of the HOLZNER reference that the Examiner has made of record. Thus, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide a copy of the title and the bibliography pages of the HOLZNER reference that show a publication date and/or an ISBN number so that there will be no uncertainties on the record about the particular edition and the particular publication date of the HOLZNER reference that the Examiner is using against the claims in the present application.

Second, in the two pages of the HOLZNER reference that the Examiner made of record, the right-hand side of each paragraph is cut off and all the sentences that span lines are incomplete. Thus, the exact meaning of most of the sentences in the HOLZNER reference cannot be ascertained. For this reason, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide the Applicants with a copy of the two pages from HOLZNER that shows complete sentences and paragraphs, so that the record can be complete for the purposes of appellate review.

2. POLIZZI does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 1 of generating and storing a mapping that maps one or more page parameters to one or more portlet parameters, where the mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with the one or more page parameters.

Among other features, Claim 1 comprises the feature of:

generating and storing a mapping that maps one or more page parameters to one or more portlet parameters, wherein the mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with the one or more page parameters;

... .

It is respectfully submitted that ABRAMS, POLIZZI, and HOLZNER do not describe this feature of Claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that this feature of Claim 1 is described in POLIZZI. This assertion is incorrect.

POLIZZI does not even mention the terms “page parameter”, “portlet parameter”, and “mapping”. While the absence of these terms doesn’t conclusively prove that POLIZZI does not disclose these limitations using other terminology, it does make it difficult to ascertain what, within POLIZZI, the Office Action is equating with these features.

Unfortunately, the Office Action does not specify exactly what structure or functionality in POLLIZI corresponds to the features of Claim 1 of page parameter, portlet parameter, and a mapping that maps page parameters to portlet parameters. Instead, the

Office Action cites paragraphs [0030], [0032], [0033], and [0092] of POLIZZI in a non-specific way that is not correlated to the features of Claim 1. Thus, the Applicants were obliged to scour POLIZZI to see if anything therein could possibly satisfy these limitations. The search failed. The Applicants could not find any structure or functionality in POLIZZI that corresponds to the mapping of Claim 1. For example, in paragraph [0030] POLIZZI describes that a portal page presents data to a user in the form of portal objects, where the user may manually select which objects are to be displayed in her portal page. Paragraphs [0038]-[0039] of POLIZZI expressly describe that the portal objects are essentially files that may have various MIME types. In paragraph [0032] POLIZZI describes that a user may customize what is displayed in her portal page by using favorites and channels, where when an object is added to the favorites, a link is added into the list of that user's favorites. In paragraph [0033] POLIZZI describes that a portal system may present to a user HTML forms through which the user may submit input data for jobs that the user can execute on a job server. Finally, in paragraph [0092] POLIZZI describes that when a user logs into the system, the portal objects that are included in the portal page for the user are retrieved from a repository and are assembled into that user's personalized portal page, where the assembled portal page is transmitted to a browser that displays the transmitted page to the user.

Significantly, however, these paragraphs from POLIZZI do not describe or suggest any use of a mapping that maps page parameters to portlet parameters of portlets that generate content based on values of the page parameters. In fact, since POLIZZI expressly describes that a personalized portal page is assembled from objects that are stored in a repository, the portal system in POLIZZI does not even need to use portlets that can generate content based on different values of the portlet parameters.

In contrast, Claim 1 expressly features generating and storing a mapping that maps

one or more page parameters to one or more portlet parameters, where the mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with the one or more page parameters.

In response to the Applicants' previous arguments, the Office Action asserts that in paragraph [0092] POLIZZI describes that a portal page is predefined based upon "saved settings/personalized data, such that the data is populated into the portal page in a code format supported by rendering browser." (See Office Action, p. 32, numbered paragraphs 11.) Thus, the Office Action asserts that the "settings/personalized data" in this paragraph of POLIZZI correspond to the mapping of Claim 1. This assertion is incorrect because in paragraph [0092] POLIZZI expressly states that

... the service broker retrieves a set of metadata corresponding to the user's personal portal page 1000 from the repository. This **metadata** indicates **which portal objects** should **also be retrieved from the repository** in order to populate portal page 1000. After all of the **portal objects have been retrieved from the repository, they are assembled** into a format which can be read by a browser program. After this, the personalized portal page 1000 is transmitted to the appropriate user 100 through the network server 105. At the user's interface, his **browser program will display the personalized portal page** 1000 to the user. (Emphasis added.)

The above passage of POLIZZI makes it very clear that: (1) the set of metadata for a user merely indicates which portal objects need to be retrieved from a repository; (2) the portal objects are retrieved from a repository; (3) after retrieval, the portal objects are merely assembled into a browser-readable format; and (4) the browser merely receives and displays the browser-readable format. Thus, the set of metadata described in this passage of POLIZZI does not describe any mapping of page parameters to portlet parameters; rather, the set of metadata merely indicates portal objects that are already generated and stored in a repository. Further, when the browser displays the portal page, the browser does not need to inspect, refer to, or otherwise access the set of metadata; rather, the browser receives a whole portal page into which the portal objects have already been assembled. In contrast, Claim 1

features a mapping of page parameters to portlet parameters, where the mapping is inspected and the data therein is used in response to a request to display a web page.

For the foregoing reasons, POLIZZI does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 1 of a mapping that maps one or more page parameters to one or more portlet parameters, where the mapping is stored separate from pages associated with the one or more page parameters.

3. ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the features of Claim 1 of: wherein using the mapping includes retrieving and inspecting the mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of a portlet; and passing a value associated with the page parameter to the portlet as a value of the portlet parameter.

Among other features, Claim 1 comprises the features of:

...;  
wherein using the mapping includes retrieving and inspecting the mapping to  
determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of a  
portlet;  
...;  
passing a value associated with the page parameter to the portlet as a value of the  
portlet parameter;  
... .

It is respectfully submitted that ABRAMS, POLIZZI, and HOLZNER do not describe these features of Claim 1.

The Office Action asserts the above features of Claim 1 are described in ABRAMS. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that input entered by a user in the graphical user interface (GUI) of ABRAMS' HTML parser tool (as explained in Figs. 2A and 2B and in col. 4, lines 13-30) corresponds to the page parameters and the mapping of Claim 1. The Office Action also asserts that something that apparently generates the user-customized portal view in col. 6, lines 12-25 of ABRAMS corresponds to the portlet of Claim 1. These assertions are incorrect.

The Office Action fails to recognize that the input provided by a user to ABRAMS' HTML parser tool in order to select summary information/headlines from various web sites (as described in col. 3, lines 47-67 and col. 4, lines 13-30) is completely different and separate from the user-defined organizational structure that may be used to generate HTML code for the purpose of displaying (as described in col. 6, lines 12-25) to the user summaries/headlines that have already been extracted by using the HTML parser tool. Specifically, the input provided to ABRAMS' HTML parser tool (as described in col. 4, lines 13-30) is used to select which summary information/headlines are to be extracted from web sites of interest to the user. On the other hand, the user-defined organizational structure described in col. 6, lines 12-25 of ABRAMS is used for generating HTML code for formatting and displaying already-extracted summary information/headlines. Thus, any user-provided data values for selecting summary information/headlines are not used to generate HTML code that would display the extracted summary information/headlines. Consequently, ABRAMS does not describe and does not even need any mapping between the user-provided input for selecting summary information/headlines and any user-defined organizational structure that is used to generate HTML code for displaying the extracted summary information/headlines.

In contrast, Claim 1 includes the feature of retrieving and inspecting the mapping between page parameters and portlet parameters to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of a portlet. Since ABRAMS does not describe any mapping between page parameters and portlet parameters and does not describe any functionality of using such mapping in response to a request to render a web page, ABRAMS does not describe the above feature of Claim 1.

Further, Claim 1 includes the feature of passing a value associated with the page parameter to the portlet as a value of the portlet parameter. The Office Action asserts that ABRAMS describes this feature in Figs. 2A, 2B, and 6. This assertion is incorrect.

In Figs. 2A and 2B, ABRAMS shows a computer screen image of a configurator (i.e. an HTML parser tool) that includes window panes and controls as seen by a user. (See also ABRAMS, col. 2, lines 36-38 and col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 30.) Significantly, and not the least because ABRAMS does not describe anything that corresponds to a portlet, these passages from ABRAMS and Figs. 2A and 2B do not describe a functionality of passing the value associated with a page parameter to a portlet as a value of a parameter of the portlet in response to a request to display a web page. In Fig. 6, ABRAMS shows a tabbed display of data summarized and organized by using ABRAMS' HTML parser tool. (See also col. 5, line 46 to col. 6, line 5.) Significantly, and not the least because what is displayed in Fig. 6 is not a web page, Fig. 6 and this passage from ABRAMS do not describe a functionality of passing the value associated with a page parameter to a portlet as a value of a parameter of the portlet in response to a request to display a web page. Thus, ABRAMS does not describe the features of Claim 1 of: wherein using the mapping includes retrieving and inspecting the mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of a portlet; and passing a value associated with the page parameter to the portlet as a value of the portlet parameter.

For the foregoing reasons, ABRAMS, POLIZZI, and HOLZNER do not describe or suggest all features of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI and further in view of HOLZNER. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

B. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 18

Claim 18 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI and further in view of HOLZNER. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Among other features, Claim 18 comprises:

- generating and storing a first mapping that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters, wherein the first mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with the one or more page parameters;
- ...;
- in response to a user manipulating a component of the web page, a portlet that previously generated the component generating a particular event;
- ...;
- logic associated with the web page intercepting data, passed by the portlet, that represents the particular event;
- retrieving and inspecting the first mapping, wherein inspecting the first mapping includes:
  - determining, based on the first mapping and the intercepted data, an action to perform in response to the particular event;
  - determining, based on the first mapping, that an event output parameter associated with the particular event is mapped to a page parameter;
  - and
- causing the action to be performed, wherein causing the action to be performed comprises passing a value of the event output parameter as the value of the page parameter;
- ... .

The above features of Claim 18 indicate a first mapping that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters.

The above features of Claim 18 also indicate that in response to a user manipulating a component of a web page, a portlet that previously generated the web page generates a particular event. Logic associated with the web page intercepts data that represents the particular event, and a first mapping is inspected based on the intercepted data to determine an action to perform in response to the particular event and that an event output parameter of the particular event is mapped to a page parameter. Thus, these features of Claim 18 indicate



that the first mapping maps at least one event generated by a portlet to an action and at least one event output parameter to a page parameter. It is respectfully submitted that ABRAMS, POLIZZI, and HOLZNER do not describe these features of Claim 18.

1. POLIZZI does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of generating and storing a first mapping that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters, where the first mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with the one or more page parameters.

Among other features, Claim 18 comprises the feature of:

generating and storing a first mapping that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters, wherein the first mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with the one or more page parameters.

The Office Action asserts that this feature of Claim 18 is described in POLIZZI. This assertion is incorrect.

As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, POLIZZI does not describe or suggest any mappings that involve page parameters. Further, the Office Action asserts that the time events described in POLIZZI are mapped to one or more “actions/updates/scheduling of a job”. This assertion is incorrect.

In paragraph [0060], POLIZZI describes a schedule that is stored in an event server, where a portal system can use the schedule to run various jobs. (It is noted that POLIZZI defines a job as an executable program file such as a report-generating application – see paragraph [0039].) To schedule a job, the job must be associated with a time event, a parameter list, and a schedule. The time event defines a timetable for running a job and the parameter list defines the compile-time and run-time values necessary to execute a job. Significantly, however, the schedule described in POLIZZI relates to executing programs at certain times and has nothing to do with pages or page parameters. Further, while paragraph

[0060] of POLIZZI may be describing that the execution of a program may be set in response to certain time events, these time events are not generated by a portlet in response to a user manipulating a web page component that was previously generated by the portlet. Rather, by referring to a schedule, POLIZZI clearly indicates that the time events are generated by a computer system clock. For at least this reason, the time events of POLIZZI do not have any particular output parameters.

In contrast, Claim 18 comprises the feature of generating and storing a first mapping that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters, where the first mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with the one or more page parameters. Thus, the mapping of Claim 18 is a two-fold mapping: (1) events are mapped to actions, and (2) event output parameters are mapped to page parameters. Further, the other features of Claim 18 indicate that at least one event mapped in the mapping is generated by a portlet in response to a user manipulating a web page component that was previously generated by the portlet. Thus, since the time schedule described in POLIZZI does not even involve any page parameters or event output parameters and since the time events in POLIZZI's system are not generated by a portlet, the time schedule of POLIZZI does not correspond to the first mapping featured in Claim 18.

**If the next Office Action continues to maintain that the time schedule described in POLIZZI equates to the first mapping featured in Claim 18, the Applicants respectfully request that the next Office Action expressly indicate exactly what in the time schedule of POLIZZI corresponds to events, actions, event output parameters, and page parameters - preferably, the next Office Action can provide a specific example with reference to the time schedule depicted in Fig. 5 of POLIZZI.**

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that POLIZZI does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of generating and storing a first mapping that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters, wherein the first mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with the one or more page parameter.

2. ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of determining, based on the first mapping and the intercepted data, an action to perform in response to the particular event.

Among other features, Claim 18 comprises the feature of:

determining, based on the first mapping and the intercepted data, an action to perform in response to the particular event.

The Office Action asserts that this feature of Claim 18 is described in col. 4, lines 21-24 of ABRAMS. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the action performed in ABRAMS to display in pane 260 all hyperlinks with their associated text for the selected web site corresponds to the above feature of Claim 18. This assertion is incorrect.

On page 16 the Office Action expressly concedes that ABRAMS does not describe a mapping that maps events to actions and event output parameters to page parameters, such as the first mapping in Claim 18. Further, as discussed above POLIZZI does not describe generating and storing a mapping such as the first mapping of Claim 18 either. Thus, POLIZZI and ABRAMS whether taken alone or in combination cannot possibly describe any functionality that is based on a mapping such as the first mapping of Claim 18.

Further, in col. 4, lines 21-24 ABRAMS describes that when a user selects a web address in pane 220 of the GUI, the HTML parser tool displays in pane 260 all hyperlinks of the site indicated by the web address. This, however, does not describe or even suggest that any determination to display the hyperlinks is made based on a mapping that maps one or

more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters. In other words, the action of displaying the selected hyperlinks is what the HTML parser tool is configured to do and is thus not subject to any determinations that are based on a mapping that is equivalent to the first mapping of Claim 18.

In contrast, Claim 18 comprises the feature of determining, based on the first mapping and the intercepted data, an action to perform in response to the particular event, where the first mapping maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters, and where the intercepted data was generated by a portlet in response to a user manipulating a web page component that was previously generated by the portlet.

Since ABRAMS does not describe a mapping such as the first mapping of Claim 18 and since the ABRAMS' HTML parser tool does not even need a functionality that is based on such mapping, ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of determining, based on the first mapping and the intercepted data, an action to perform in response to the particular event.

3. ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of determining, based on the first mapping, that an event output parameter associated with the particular event is mapped to a page parameter.

Among other features, Claim 18 comprises:

determining, based on the first mapping, that an event output parameter associated with the particular event is mapped to a page parameter.

The Office Action asserts that this feature of Claim 18 is described in col. 4, lines 21-29 of ABRAMS. This assertion is incorrect.

As discussed above, in col. 4, lines 21-30 and with respect to its Figs. 2A and 2B, ABRAMS describes that when a user selects a web address in pane 220 of the GUI, the

HTML parser tool displays in pane 260 all hyperlinks of the site indicated by the web address. Significantly, however, neither this passage nor any other passages of ABRAMS describe or suggest that any mapping is inspected in the process of displaying selected hyperlinks in a pane of the GUI of the HTML parser tool. In fact, in col. 4, line 21 ABRAMS expressly states that the program (i.e., the HTML parser tool) displays the selected hyperlinks, which suggests that any processing based on the user-specified URL (including displaying in the GUI) is performed internally within the executable code of the HTML parser tool without the need to reference any external mapping such as the first mapping of Claim 18.

In contrast, Claim 18 includes the feature of determining, based on the first mapping, that an event output parameter associated with the particular event is mapped to a page parameter, where the first mapping maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters.

Since ABRAMS does not describe a mapping such as the first mapping of Claim 18 and since the ABRAMS' HTML parser tool does not even need a functionality that is based on such mapping, ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of determining, based on the first mapping, that an event output parameter associated with the particular event is mapped to a page parameter.

4. ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of causing the action to be performed, wherein causing the action to be performed comprises passing a value of the event output parameter as the value of the page parameter.

Among other features, Claim 18 comprises:

... wherein causing the action to be performed comprises passing a value of the event output parameter as the value of the page parameter.

The Office Action asserts that this feature of Claim 18 is described in col. 4, lines 21-29 of ABRAMS. This assertion is incorrect.

As discussed above, in col. 4, lines 21-30 and with respect to its Figs. 2A and 2B, ABRAMS describes that when a user selects a web address in pane 220 of the GUI, the HTML parser tool displays in pane 260 all hyperlinks of the site indicated by the web address. Significantly, however, neither this passage nor any other passages of ABRAMS describe or suggest that any value of an event output parameter is passed as the value of a page parameter in the process of displaying selected hyperlinks in a pane of the GUI of the HTML parser tool. In fact, in col. 4, line 21 ABRAMS expressly states that the program (i.e., the HTML parser tool) displays the selected hyperlinks, which suggests that any processing based on the user-specified URL (including displaying in the GUI) is performed internally within the executable code of the HTML parser tool. Further, this clearly indicates that ABRAMS' HTML parser tool does not even need any functionality that is performed in response to an external event and that is configured to resolve the external event by referencing an external mapping such as the first mapping of Claim 18.

In contrast, Claim 18 includes the feature of causing the action to be performed, wherein causing the action to be performed comprises passing a value of the event output parameter as the value of the page parameter, where the event output parameter and the page parameter are determined based on a first mapping that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters, and where the action is determined based on the first mapping and on intercepted data that represents a portlet-generated event.

Since ABRAMS does not describe a mapping such as the first mapping of Claim 18 and since the ABRAMS' HTML parser tool does not even need a functionality that responds

to external events based on such mapping, ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of causing the action to be performed, wherein causing the action to be performed comprises passing a value of the event output parameter as the value of the page parameter.

For the foregoing reasons, ABRAMS, POLIZZI, and HOLZNER do not describe or suggest all features of Claim 18. Thus, Claim 18 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI and further in view of HOLZNER. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 18 is respectfully requested.

C. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 49

Claim 49 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI and further in view of HOLZNER.

Claim 49 includes features similar to the features of Claim 1 discussed above, except in the context of a computer-readable medium. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 49 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI and further in view of HOLZNER for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 49 is respectfully requested.

D. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 66

Claim 66 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI and further in view of HOLZNER.

Claim 66 includes features similar to the features of Claim 18 discussed above, except in the context of a computer-readable medium. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 66 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI and further in view of HOLZNER for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 18. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 66 is respectfully requested.

E. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, AND 67-72

Claims 2-3, 5-14, 16-17, 19-23, 47, 50-51, 53-62, 64-65, and 67-72 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI and further in view of HOLZNER. Claims 4 and 52 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI, further in view of HOLZNER, and further in view of Hind et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0205555 (“HIND”). Claims 15 and 63 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI, further in view of HOLZNER, and further in view of Katariya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,564,251 (“KATARIYA”).

Each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 depends directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66, and thus includes each and every feature of the independent base claim. Furthermore, in rejecting Claims 4, 15, 52, and 63 the Office Action relies explicitly on ABRAMS, POLIZZI, and HOLZNER, and not on HIND or KATARIYA, to show the features discussed above with respect to Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66. Because ABRAMS, POLIZZI, and HOLZNER do not teach the subject matter of Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66, any combination of ABRAMS, POLIZZI, and HOLZNER with the other two references necessarily fails to teach the complete combination recited in any dependent claim of Claims 1, 18, 49, or 66. Thus, each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 is allowable for the reasons given above for Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66.

In addition, each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 introduces one or more additional features that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 are allowable for the reasons given



above with respect to Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 is respectfully requested.

## II. CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed. Further, for the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: February 8, 2010

/StoychoDDraganoff#56181/

Stoycho D. Draganoff

Reg. No. 56,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1089  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 208  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076